Oxford 1895.

FILE COPY

Office - Supreme Court, U.
FILED
NOV 19 1945
CHARLES ELMORE CROPL
CLER

No. ~~12~~; Original

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1945

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff,

vs.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

MOTION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION AND MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME WITHIN WHICH TO ANSWER.

ROBERT W. KENNY,
Attorney General,
State of California.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1945

No. 12, Original

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME WITHIN WHICH TO ANSWER

The State of California, by its Attorney General, asks leave of the Court to file its Motion for Extension of Time Within Which to Answer submitted herewith.

ROBERT W. KENNY,
Attorney General,
State of California.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1945

No. 12, Original

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME WITHIN WHICH TO ANSWER

MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT:

Comes now the above-named defendant, the State of California, and presents this, its motion for extension of time within which to respond to the complaint in the above-entitled cause, and, in support thereof presents the following:

Reasons for This Motion

The United States on October 19, 1945, filed its motion for leave to file bill of complaint. On October 22, 1945, this Court entered its order granting leave to file the bill of complaint and directing process to issue returnable on December 28, 1945.

The undersigned Attorney General of the State of California was absent from the United States on prior engagements until November 10, 1945. Adequate presentation of the case for the State of California will obviously involve much research, legal and factual. Moreover, there arise *in limine* numerous questions which must be resolved or obviated by counsel and which as well require a large amount of investigation and factual research before adequate response to the complaint can be made. The staff available to counsel for the State of California is so limited at the present time that the making of a return on December 28, 1945, complicated by the printing delays incident to the Christmas holiday season, will not only embarrass the routine work of said staff but will as well create the likelihood of prejudice to the rights of the State of California.

WHEREFORE, the defendant respectfully prays that the time within which return of process in the above-entitled cause may be made in this Honorable Court be extended for a period of one month to and including January 28, 1946.

ROBERT W. KENNY,
Attorney General,
State of California.

(1372)

FILE COPY

Office - Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
DEC 24 1945
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1945.

No. 6 ORIGINAL.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF,
v.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DEFENDANT.

Motion for Leave to Intervene.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, by its Attorney General, asks leave of the Court to intervene in the above-entitled complaint.

CLARENCE A. BARNES,
Attorney General,
J. J. SPIEGEL,
Assistant Attorney General,
GEORGE P. DRURY,
Assistant Attorney General.

Statement in Support of Motion.

The territorial boundaries of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts extend one marine length from its seashore at extreme low water mark. If an inlet or arm of the sea does not exceed two marine leagues in width between its headlands, a straight line from one headland to the other is equivalent to the shore line.

Dunham v. *Lamphere,* 3 Gray (Mass.) 268, 270.
United States v. *Bevans,* 3 Wheat. 336.
St. 1859, Massachusetts, c. 289.
Gen. Sts., Massachusetts, c. 1, § 1.
Pub. Sts., Massachusetts, c. 1, § 1.
Revised Laws, Massachusetts, c. 1, § 1.
Gen. Laws, Massachusetts, c. 1, § 3.

Massachusetts was one of the thirteen original colonies and it succeeded to the rights of the crown of England, with the same territorial limits, which have always included the ocean within one marine league. Its rights have been established by many decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts.

It makes no difference whether the body of water under consideration is a bay, however large, the entrance of which is between headlands less than two marine leagues apart, as in *Commonwealth* v. *Manchester,* 152 Mass. 230, or the open sea within one marine league from shore, as in *Dunham* v. *Lamphere,* 3 Gray, 368. The law, as stated above, has frequently been recognized by the administrative departments of the United States, as well as its Courts.

Massachusetts does not own the lands between high and low water mark, except in the case of flats extending more than one hundred rods from ordinary high water mark, as

they were granted to the owners of the shore by a Colonial Ordinance in 1647.

East Boston Co. v. *Commonwealth*, 203 Mass. 68, 72.
Wonson v. *Wonson*, 14 Allen (Mass.) 71, 82.

All land under navigable water within one marine league, *i.e.*, three nautical miles, from shore belongs to the State.

Manchester v. *Massachusetts*, 139 U.S. 240, 257.
Commonwealth v. *Manchester*, 152 Mass. 230.
Smith v. *Maryland*, 18 How. 71, 74.
Pollard v. *Hagan*, 3 How. 212, 230.
Martin v. *Waddell*, 16 Pet. 367, 410.

The same boundary principle applies to all States admitted after the thirteen original States ratified the Constitution, upon the same terms and conditions as those original states.

Pollard v. *Hagan*, 3 How. 212.
Goodtitle v. *Kibbe*, 9 How. 471.
Weber v. *Harbor Commissioners*, 18 Wall. 57.
Shively v. *Bowlby*, 152 U.S. 1.

Therefore, a decision against the State of California in the pending cause would cast great doubt upon the rights of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and justice and law require that this Commonwealth be permitted to intervene to protect its rights. Accordingly this Commonwealth desires an opportunity to deny and controvert the allegations of the petition and to meet the claims made in behalf of the United States by paragraphs II and VII thereof.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts further suggests that the reservation of rights, as suggested in the note following the statement in support of motion for leave to file complaint made by the Attorney General of the United States, might invite further litigation, and that intervention by this Commonwealth at this time will tend to avoid further litigation.

CLARENCE A. BARNES,
Attorney General,
J. J. SPIEGEL,
Assistant Attorney General,
GEORGE P. DRURY,
Assistant Attorney General.